

Kendall County – Boerne – Fair Oaks Transportation Committee Minutes

**17 August 2021
2:01 – 4:00 p.m.**

In Attendance:

Don Durden, Bob Manning, John Kight, Bitsy Pratt, Bryce Boddie, Northern Hendricks, Gary Louie, Del Eulberg, Ben Eldredge, Rich Sena, Jeff Carroll, Rankin D'Spain, Henry Acosta, Joe Dumanel for Bobby Balli, and Tim Bannwolf.

Not in Attendance:

Jonah Evans, Josh Limmer, Kim Blohm, Marcus Garcia, Stephen Zoeller, and Steve Sharma.

Item 1: OPENING REMARKS

Bob Manning opens the meeting. He explains that with the new Covid-19 Delta Variant emerging, it has been brought to their attention that they have suspended their meetings before. But Manning thinks it is important to informally express their support for attendants of meetings to wear masks, continue social distancing, and to exercise whatever behavior anybody feels they must to protect themselves. For now, the committee is trying to carry on.

Don Durden mentions that he has spoken with Cecelio from AAMPO on having him come and present some data to the committee. He is not on the agenda for this meeting, but they are hoping he will have some information for them at the following meeting.

Item 2: CONSIDER APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 20, 2021 AND AUGUST 3, 2021

Durden opens the floor to approve the minutes from July 20, 2021 and August 3, 2021. Rankin D'Spain makes a motion to approve both sets of minutes. The motion is seconded by Gary Louie. With no objections from the committee, Durden announces the adoption of both sets of minutes.

Item 3: PUBLIC COMMENT

There are no comments made from the public at this time, but Milan Michalec, Board President of the Cow Creek Groundwater Conservation District is prompted by Durden to read aloud a new ordinance regarding recharge features and transportation in Kendall County. It reads:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THAT ANY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AVOID SENSITIVE RECHARGE FEATURES WITHIN KENDALL COUNTY

WHEREAS, the Cow Creek Groundwater Conservation District is charged with the stewardship and regulation of the groundwater resources within the boundaries of Kendall County; and

WHEREAS, many known and unknown sensitive recharge features exist within the District, for example, the areas around Cibolo Creek and the Lower Glen Rose formation outcrop are recognized as significant recharge features within Kendall County; and

WHEREAS, the Lower Glen Rose formation outcrop has a high density of sensitive recharge features including closed depressions, sinkholes, caves, solution cavities, solution-enlarged fractures, swallet holes, faults, fractures, bedding plane surfaces, and reef deposits; and

WHEREAS, the District opposes the location of any major proposed transportation project that may negatively affect recharge, water quality or water quantity; and

WHEREAS, the Directors of the Cow Creek Groundwater Conservations District recognize the value of recharge and the protection of sensitive recharge areas.

NOW, therefore, be it resolved and ordered by the directors of the Cow Creek Groundwater Conservation District that:

- 1. The District expressly requests that any transportation planning include a geologic assessment of any proposed routes.*
- 2. The District requests the opportunity to review and comment on any geologic assessments prepared for planning purposes.*

3. *The District requests that alternative/existing routes be given priority consideration to any route proposing a new crossing of the Cibolo Creek.*
4. *The District requests that extraordinary engineering measures be taken to protect and maintain sensitive recharge features and provide for protection from spills and releases.*
5. *The District further requests that if a proposed route must cross any sensitive recharge areas, then that route should be designed as an elevated parkway to limit on and off ramps and impact to the surface geology/hydrology.*

Signed and enter this 9th day of August 2021.

After reading, Michalec opens the floor for questions. He also notes that consent was voted unanimously when presented to the board.

Durden asks for clarification that the title says to "...avoid sensitive recharge", but that the amendment leaves room that if building on sensitive recharge must happen, there is room for qualifying exceptions. Michalec says that is correct. Their legal limitations are extreme, but he notes that the District is not looking to overstep those boundaries.

Durden also asks for clarification on #5, asking what the major goal is for designing an elevated parkway as opposed to a surface roadway to limit on and off ramps. Michalec notes that the District is very focused on limiting access to roadways.

Ben Eldredge speaks up to say that he was in the room when the document was being drafted and that the main focus was on a bridge potentially being built so that the sensitive karst areas are minimally impacted.

Manning chimes in and clarifies what Dr. Veni had said in his presentation, which was that even building pillars on karst would require questioning. Michalec responds and says there are devices that can be engineered to alleviate those concerns.

Louie asks if the District plans to present to City Council. He notes that for the long-term, he does not support this statement, but he also thinks the

committee does not have the authority to support it. He notes that it could be implemented as a policy recommendation.

Durden moves on to mention Bobby Balli not being present because he came down with an illness. He introduces Joe Dumanel who is sitting in his stead.

Durden thanks Michalec and the Board for their efforts in creating the statement. Michalec notes that their intent is to increase the public knowledge regarding karst features.

**Item 4: CONSIDERATION OF AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON
 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PROJECTS
SUBCOMMITTEE FOR BISD SE QUADRANT AND SW
QUADRANT PROJECTS**

Bitsy Pratt kicks off this item saying that it was the overall goal of the Projects Subcommittee to improve transit around Boerne. She said they wanted to present options that would be low in contention and that they could reach a consensus on. She notes that small changes over time could have a major impact. She hopes they will be able to reassess and measure the impacts of those changes. With road planning, future projections are important because of the cost and the need for ROW.

She explains that a big deficit within the County is that they do not have a transportation plan and that it is recommended by many to adopt one. Having a transportation plan would allow conversations to happen in a more formalized fashion with new developments coming into the community.

Pratt mentions that school traffic is a big contributor to some of the transportation issues in the county currently. One problem that has been identified is that neighborhoods are not linked up allowing buses to travel from one subdivision to another to pick up and drop off students. Subdivision gates being closed also poses a problem.

She also mentions a lack of sidewalks and safe bike/hike paths for anyone that lives within walking distance of their campus to get to school. She notes that they understand they cannot impose these ideas on the owners of the roads but says that the City has control over some of the roads they

were looking into. She suggests having conversations with each subdivision's HOA.

Another issue she says is Highway 46 and how that could be impacted. She says that adding sidewalks would more than likely eliminate parking for football games and major events at the high school. They recommend that the City and County discuss options for that, but she suggests possibly looking at a trolley system for things like that.

Another project they looked at is potentially building a hike-and-bike pathway for commutes to school in the northeast quadrant near the Brown Creek flood area.

Next, she notes that the subcommittee is aware there are proposals for roundabouts at Cascade Caverns. They are suggesting signage for directing traffic off Highway 46 to IH-10.

Regarding Main Street traffic, she says they need information from the Main Street merchants. Is parking a problem? Is there enough crossing? Are there too many cars on the road? When are the peak hours, or is traffic random? What is the financial impact when Main Street is closed?

She notes that AAMPO has presented preliminary work on the traffic issues, and they have offered their assistance to the subcommittee.

She turns to a map print-out as defined by the BISD demographers report that highlights 85% of the expected growth over the next decade. Looking at Highway 46, there is a good majority of growth that will take place on the southern side. She notes that the project summary focuses on the areas toward the south.

Next, Pratt mentions an overpass on Balcones Creek and I-10 in Bexar County, but there is a development proposing to grant access on Old Fredericksburg Road with an HEB on the south side.

She says the first project on the subcommittee's recommendation list is Cascade Caverns. There is a proposal with AAMPO to put in a roundabout. Jeff Carroll says the City has made a submittal for I-10 to Buckskin and Scenic Loop to Cascade Caverns. The roundabout would be at Old San Antonio Road and Cascade Caverns. It will be discussed at the next

AAMPO meeting he says. He also notes that there will be a temporary turn-lane along Cascade down to Southglen.

Pratt says BISD had identified this as a challenging area for kids to get to school because there are no good sidewalks or crossings.

Manning chimes in and asks if it has been considered to put in a 3-foot-high barrier to keep bikes from veering into traffic. Pratt says no.

Eldredge says this is an important area to create walkability for all ages. Pratt says the biggest concern is ROW.

John's Road is the second project improvement on the subcommittee's list. She says the long-term solution is to have 5 lanes of traffic, and the short-term is a two-lane with left-turn lanes.

The third project recommendation is the Old Fredericksburg Road low-water crossing being built to accommodate a 10-year event. Carroll says this will make a connection from Old Fredericksburg Road to Balcones Creek.

Durden turns a question about groundwater to the Cow Creek representative, Michalec. He asks if the representatives will take a position on that. Michalec responds saying it can be complicated and that there will have to be discussion about it. The EEA has well-documented criteria for development in these areas. Durden clarifies: as long as the EEA is OK with it, transportation would be acceptable? Representatives say they would have to look at the plans in those areas.

Pratt moves on to the next project: the southwest side. The subcommittee's recommendation is that they improve Enterprise Parkway coming off Scenic Loop to ease congestion at Scenic and I-10. Carroll says this is a plan that is on the City's 5-year to-do list.

Next, Pratt directs attention further south to the Corley Farms area. Their proposal is a connector to Upper Balcones and Valerie Lane that would provide more east and west connection. Carroll says that part will get built with the Corley Farms subdivision and that will tie into Telford Road. He says when either 500 homes are built or a new school is built, they will have to build again. Pratt says she would like to see a shared path built for kids to get to school crossing Valerie Lane. Carroll says once Buc-ee's

comes, there will be a connection from Regent Boulevard that will tie into Corley Farms. Rich Sena says folks will have a way to get to Main Street without even going near Balcones.

Eldredge questions the huge ROWs. Carroll says that the Major Thoroughfare Plan requires 96-102 feet of ROW. He notes it can be used for drainage and to protect trees.

Pratt moves on to the next project: Coughran Road which will tie into Spencer Ranch Road. She says the short-term suggestion is to put in a light at Highway 46 and Coughran. Coughran connects to Upper Balcones. Carroll chimes in and says that Spencer Ranch will build a partial 4-lane highway all the way up to Spencer Ranch. Per the Major Thoroughfare Plan, eventually those developments would give the City ROW. Pratt notes that the light would serve for safety purposes.

The next project is at the northeast quadrant. She says the subcommittee looked at School Street to get a center turn lane and sidewalks for safe walking. She notes that School Street could become a more robust option for moving traffic north to I-10.

Esperanza is next, which she notes has a lot of “what-ifs”. A suggestion they have would be to connect hike/bike trails to the Bentwood neighborhood for kids to get to their schools. She notes that the floodplain does now allow for much use, but they wanted to put the idea out there.

To support Pratt, Sena chimes in and says that right now the children who go to Herff Elementary do not have safe walkways to get to school. Right now, everyone must take Highway 46, and if the goal is to reduce traffic on Highway 46 it would be good to have an alternative way to get to school.

Durden notes that it would be appealing to the Bentwood community to expand the hike/bike path if the opportunity presented itself.

Carroll mentions that the trails in Esperanza are owned by the HOA and are not open to the public. So, this idea would require a conversation with Esperanza. Pratt agrees that that is an obstacle.

Manning chimes in and says that when he was serving on City Council, there was an idea to build a trail behind a particular neighborhood that was being proposed, and the residents of the surrounding community were

convinced that it would increase the crime rate in that area. Pratt notes that it could be a good outreach opportunity.

The next project is on Adler Road. The proposal is to create a left turn lane, center turn lanes and sidewalks as the long-term solution. The short-term proposal is for a center turn lane to facilitate better flowing traffic. She notes that Adler could be an opportunity to get around Main Street. Roundabouts would also be easy to navigate. The cross between Adler and Esser, she says, would be a good opportunity for a roundabout. They are suggesting a pedestrian walkway that would cause them to give up parking on Esser for football games.

Boddie speaks up and says they could use the bike lane for parking for big events on the few times a year that it is needed. Carroll chimes in and says it is very easy to change the stripes on the road to make it 3 lanes with a bike lane. Pratt notes that these are ideas to be fleshed out.

Manning asks about improvements on School Street and Adler. He notices the suggestions from the subcommittee's presentation does not show a roundabout. Pratt says it is in the interim report.

Durden notes that he is trying to think through what the best way to sequence the projects.

Pratt says they left Coughran in because of Spencer which was a new connection. She says the way to integrate is to get the funding information figured out. She hopes they can integrate the interim projects as well as the projects from the subcommittee's report. She notes that they agreed with the interim projects and did not want to change any of that information.

Carroll says some things may not get included because the City is already working on them.

Manning hopes to have a one-page handout ready for the council members when it is time for presentation of suggestions. He says he would like to add the magnitude of cost, the expression of public support, etc.

Eldredge notes that nodes are not addressed in the report, but he thinks those are hugely important. Pratt says that did not come through in the report because they were trying to be hasty, but she notes that the report is amendable.

Louie chimes in and says that the projects seem to follow a geographic flow. He thinks the projects should not be on the report in order of importance or priority, but he foresees the report showing 24-25 projects that virtually everyone agrees on and would allow the public entities to make the final decisions.

Durden notes that it is not the committee's job to prioritize the projects. He asks if the committee is interested in weighing in on TxDOT's future plans. He says they must decide priority in the context of what confronts them, but he does not think they can do that as a committee.

Manning chimes in and says regarding cost estimates, he reiterates that the committee must keep in mind that the court gave them 3 charges and they are responsible for those.

Item 5: CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT FINAL REPORT TABLE OF CONTENTS AND SCHEDULE

Durden asks the committee if they want to adopt the report, modify it, or change it. He says the first step is to say whether they are happy with the projects listed and if they can agree that they fall into a plan for the long-term, short-term, or developer projects.

Pratt notes that some projects are already in development agreements.

Sena says it is important for the community to see because they may not be aware of the different road improvements that will be implemented to make travel easier.

Eldredge chimes in and asks how major thoroughfare roads are achieved. How does the committee propose that those be fulfilled? Is this a short-term or long-term goal.

Durden says the extension of Corley Road is not covered by a development agreement. He says someone will have to step up to the plate to make that connection happen. He suggests that the committee weigh in on the importance of that project. Do they suggest it be part of the Major Thoroughfare Plan?

Carroll chimes in and says that the Major Thoroughfare Plan is there to guide developers in connecting roads and neighborhoods.

Durden says there has been a lot of discussion regarding green field roads.

John Kight notes that he thinks it is important for the public to know and understand the committee's thoughts behind each decision.

Boddie suggests that there be some clarification about sizes of roads and who will be executing what.

Northern Hendricks says the subcommittee had discussed putting public input into the report, but they are needing the data. The plan was to create something similar and more intense than the information drawn from those tables. She suggests deciding where each project fits so that when the crowd-sourcing data comes in they can see how it all relates.

Sena says the real question is if the County is interested in bumping up to a 25-year support plan as opposed to a 10-year projection. Dumanel agrees saying they will not get much from a 10-year plan.

Eldredge says that he likes the report, but he thinks there is a lot missing.

Durden asks if anyone contests the geographic location of any of the hike-and-bike pathways or sidewalks.

Eldredge says the broader question is: are there controversial pieces? He mentions the public feedback component.

Durden says he thinks the subcommittee has come up with good, well-thought-out suggestions. He notes it will trigger the policy makers to take a closer look. He also does not think that controversial pieces should be left off.

Pratt mentions green tail and needing ROW. Carroll says those segments are on the Major Thoroughfare Plan.

Louie chimes in and says he thinks a consolidated list would be helpful in seeing which projects are already under development in Kendall County, and whether there are driving needs outside of Precinct 4 and Boerne. He thinks those need to be discussed within the next couple meetings.

Durden reminds the committee that they are not approving the report today, but he is hearing strong support overall. He does not want to ram-rod it all through. He says he will come back with updates at the next meeting. His goal is to consider them formally and act to either adopt or reject.

Item 6: DISCUSSION REGARDING HOW ADDITIONAL PROJECTS NOT IDENTIFIED BY THE PROJECTS SUBCOMMITTEE ARE TO BE IDENTIFIED AND VETTED

Manning mentions the crowd sourcing assessment and how he would really like to move faster on getting that information organized. He says this is a citizen's-based committee and they need that information to be able to act accordingly.

Hendricks chimes in crediting Cecelio from AAMPO saying that he is doing a fantastic job in putting it all together.

Durden notes again that he thinks Cecelio will be at the next meeting.

Durden moves on and says he think the City has a Capital Improvements Plan. He turns to Carroll and asks how hard it would be for the committee to see the plan? Carroll responds and says it would be easy. He has a one-page summary available.

Eldredge mentions that it would be good to see what the City is already working on. Carroll notes that sometimes projects will get drawn out, so they have project summaries.

Kight chimes in and says it would be a good idea to create projects that would help mobility for emergency vehicles to help improve safety across town.

Eldredge says the City is currently working on those solutions. Kight replies that the drainage is critical as well.

Carroll says the City is working on stormwater projects and looking at how to fund those.

Kight says a low water crossing map could be helpful. Carroll notes he is currently making exhibits now for the Commissioner's Court.

Item 7: CONSIDERATION OF A PUBLIC PROPOSAL FOR AN EXTRA MEETING AUGUST 31, 2021

Durden notes that the committee has had a general desire to get through this in the fall of this year, but he says that timeline could require extra meetings. He notes that August would be a good month to have an extra

meeting because there are five Tuesdays, but they would still carry out their regular meeting on the first Tuesday of September.

The consensus is yes, they will add the extra meeting and carry out the regularly scheduled meeting on the first Tuesday of September.

Item 8: PUBLIC COMMENT

Tom Adlestein chimes in and says he enjoyed the presentation and the visual aids. He thinks those will help sell the public on the new ideas. He also says that the public will probably push back regarding Cascade Caverns and I-10. He thinks a roundabout will be a great solution, but it could get trapped by the gridlock.

Carroll responds and says that part of that has to do with the light timing because TxDOT prioritizes movement on the Frontage Roads.

Sena chimes in and makes a recommendation to include 2-3 sentences describing the logic behind each recommendation in the Final Report.

Hendricks says she plans to create a spreadsheet regarding the Capital Improvements.

Vialissa Gearhardt asks if there is a short-term/long-term identifier. She says if a timeline cannot be identified, things could change in the next ten years and then they would be right back where they started.

Hendricks asks if there is a standard definition, and Kight replies that is hard to do because short-term and long-term mean something different to everyone.

Durden notes that everyone wants that sense of security, but he notes that they must be honest and realistic because they do not know what will happen with the virus or the water shortage.

Sena notes that the presentation from this meeting lays out the next 10-13 years.

Another public commenter says they he is left wondering about Upper Balcones.

Pratt responds and says that is an error of omission. She says the subcommittee discussed it. Carroll chimes in and says developments would have to give up some of their ROW.

Item 9: ADJOURNMENT

The committee adjourned at 4:00 p.m.